



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/669,104	09/23/2003	Bjorn Nolte	P03.0383	3092
26574	7590	08/29/2009		
SCHIEF HARDIN, LLP PATENT DEPARTMENT 233 S. Wacker Drive-Suite 6600 CHICAGO, IL 60606-6473			EXAMINER ALTSCHUL, AMBER L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3686	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/20/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/669,104

Applicant(s)

NOLTE, BJORN

Examiner

AMBER L. ALTSCHUL

Art Unit

3686

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 June 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date February 24, 2009
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This communication is in response to the amendment filed on June 3, 2009. Claims 1-7 and 9-12 remain pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on February 24, 2009 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-7 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent Number 5,513,101, Pinsky, et al., hereinafter Pinsky.

5. (Previously Presented) As per claim 1, Pinsky teaches a medical system architecture comprising:

at least one imaging modality that acquires medical examination images, (column 1, lines 44-67);

a computer workstation associated with said at least one imaging modality, (column 1, lines 44-67);

a data transfer device that transfers data and messages and said medical examination images between at least one client and at least one server, (column 1, lines 44-67);

a storage device connected to said data transfer device that stores at least said medical examination images, (column 1, lines 44-67);

at least one further computer workstation connected to said data transfer device configured for post-processing said data and said examination images, (column 1, lines 44-67); and

a proxy server in communication exclusively with said data transfer device configured to convert said messages between said at least one client and said at least one server according to predetermined transformation rules that make operation of said proxy server transparent to said data transfer device, and thus to said at least one imaging modality, said computer workstation, said storage device and said at least one further computer workstation, (column 1, lines 44-67, column 5, lines 51-59, column 7, lines 1-6).

6. (Original) As per claim 2, Pinsky teaches the system of claim 1 as described above. Pinsky further teaches wherein said data transfer device exchanges said data, examination images and messages according to the DICOM standard, (column 2, lines 1-24 and column 8, lines 32-50).

7. (Original) Regarding claim 3, Pinsky teaches the system of claim 1 as described above. Pinsky further teaches comprising a rules memory, accessible by said proxy server, wherein said transformation rules are stored, (column 4, lines 8-29).
8. (Original) Regarding claim 4, Pinsky teaches the system of claim 1 as described above. Pinsky further teaches wherein said proxy server comprises a software product separate from said data transfer device, (column 4, lines 1-7).
9. (Original) Regarding claim 5, Pinsky teaches the system of claim 1 as described above. Pinsky further teaches wherein said proxy server operates at a same system node as said data transfer device, (column 5, lines 42-50).
10. (Original) Regarding claim 6, Pinsky teaches the system of claim 1 as described above. Pinsky further wherein said proxy server operates on a network node, (column 3, lines 19-44).
11. (Previously Presented) Regarding claim 7, Pinsky teaches a method for exchanging messages, comprising the steps of:

Providing a network comprising a plurality of nodes and a proxy server formulating messages at a first of said nodes which are to be transmitted to another of such nodes via [[a]] said network, each of said messages having a content, (column 5, lines 51-59, column 6, lines 38-67, column 7, lines 1-6, column 10, lines 5-9 and 46-52, and column 11, lines 24-30);

exchanging said messages between a client and a server connected to said network at respective nodes of said network, (column 5, lines 51-59 and column 7, lines 1-6); and

in said proxy server manipulating the respective contents of said messages during transmission of said messages in said network using a computerized conversion routine

employing predetermined transformation rules that make said proxy server transparent to all of said nodes, (column 1, lines 44-67, column 5, lines 51-59, column 6, lines 38-67, column 7, lines 1-6, column 10, lines 5-9 and 46-52, and column 11, lines 24-30).

12. (Original) Regarding claim 9, Pinsky teaches the method of claim 7 as described above. Pinsky further teaches comprising formulating said messages according to the DICOM standard, (column 5, lines 51-59 and column 7, lines 1-6, and column 8, lines 32-50).

13. (Original) Regarding claim 10, Pinsky teaches the method of claim 7 as described above. Pinsky further teaches comprising selectively reconfiguring said predetermined transformation rules as needed, (column 6, lines 38-67).

14. (Original) Regarding claim 11, Pinsky teaches the system of claim 7 as described above. Pinsky further teaches comprising storing said predetermined transformation rules in a rules memory, and executing said conversion routine to manipulate the respective contents of the messages in a proxy server having access to said rules memory, (column 1, lines 44-67, and column 8, lines 32-50).

15. (Original) Regarding claim 12, Pinsky teaches the system of claim 7 as described above. Pinsky further teaches wherein said network comprises a plurality of DICOM nodes, and wherein the step of manipulating the respective contents of said messages comprises manipulating the respective contents of said messages in a manner transparent to said DICOM nodes, (and column 8, lines 32-50 and column 10, lines 46-52).

Response to Arguments

16. In the remarks filed June 3, 2009, Applicant argues in substance that (A) Pinsky, et al. fails to disclose a proxy server for converting messages between at least one client and at least one server according to predetermined transformation rules, (B) that Pinsky, et al. therefore does not teach dependent claims 2-6 since they set forth different aspects related to the same general concept as claim 1, (C) that Pinsky, et al., does not teach independent claim 7 which is comparable to independent claim 1 and therefore does not teach depending claims 9-12 since they depend from claim 7.

(A) At pages 2-4 of the June 3, 2009 response, Applicant argues that Pinsky does not teach a proxy server for converting messages between at least one client and at least one server according to predetermined transformation rules.

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. It is readily apparent that Pinsky a proxy server for converting messages between at least one client and at least one server according to predetermined transformation rules, (column 1, lines 44-67, column 3, lines 19-44, column 5, lines 51-59, column 6, lines 38-67, column 7, lines 57-63, column 8, lines 3-12, column 10, lines 5-9 and 46-52, and column 11, lines 24-30). Thus, the Examiner respectfully contends that Pinsky's system of using a server, WAN/LAN and image acquiring hospitals coupled to a regional radiology hub is an art recognized equivalent to a proxy server for converting messages between at least one client and at least one server according to predetermined transformation rules.

(B) At page 5 of the June 3, 2009 response, Applicant argues that Pinsky, et al. therefore does not teach dependent claims 2-6 since they set forth different aspects related to the same general concept as claim 1.

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Claims 2-6 are dependent from Applicant's independent claim 1. As such, Applicant's remarks with regard to the application of Pinsky to these claims is moot in the above Office Action.

(C) At page 5 of the June 3, 2009 response, Applicant argues that Pinsky does not teach independent claim 7 which is comparable to independent claim 1 and therefore does not teach depending claims 9-12 since they depend from claim 7.

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Claims 9-12 are dependent from Applicant's independent claim 7. As such, Applicant's remarks with regard to the application of Pinsky to these claims is moot in the above Office Action.

17. Applicant's arguments with regard to the application of Pinsky to claims 1-7 and 9-12 are moot in the above Office Action.

Conclusion

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

19. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

20. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amber L. Altschul whose telephone number is (571) 270-1362. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30-5, F 7:30-4, every other Friday off.

22. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gerald J. O'Connor can be reached at (571) 272-6787. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571) 273-8300.

23. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-8219.

24. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or (571) 272-1000.

/A. L. A./

Examiner, Art Unit 3686

August 17, 2009

/Gerald J. O'Connor/
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 3686